

Then in 1989, something happened. In 1989, the rate of increase for public expenditures went to its highest level—11.9 percent; private levels going up at 10.3 percent. Then, in 1990, public expenditures went up 13.2 percent; for the second year in a row, public expenditures went up faster than private, a trend that has continued to this day unabated.

In 1991, public expenditures are still up in the double digits—12.6 percent, but market forces are beginning to assert themselves in the private marketplace, and the private expenditures only increased 5.6 percent. It did not stay down that low the next year. They came up to 6.9; but public expenditures stayed in double digits at 10.8 percent.

Now they have been getting better. In 1993, public expenditures 8.5, but private is 7.2. In 1994, public expenditures come down to 7.8; but private drops to 5.3 percent.

For the minority leader to say that the reason we cannot do something about the expanding growth of Medicare is because Medicare expenditures are going up at the same rate as private expenditures, is to ignore the facts of the case.

Private expenditures are coming down in terms of the percentage growth at a faster rate than public expenditures are coming down. Indeed, Madam President, if we were to take the minority leader's statement at face value, where he says:

Medicare Program costs are increasing because all health care insurance costs are increasing on a per capita basis. Medicare and Medicare costs are increasing at the same rate as privately insured costs.

If that statement were true, that would mean that Medicare and Medicaid costs would be increasing at 5.3 percent per year, which figure, Madam President, is within the band the Budget Committee is considering for increases for Medicare and Medicaid.

I have sat in on the budget briefing and I have heard the budgeteers say, "If only we could get the rate of increase down to 5 percent, we could solve all of our problems." The rate of increase is down to 5 percent in private expenditures.

The minority leader thinks the two are the same. Perhaps he has them confused and thinks that the private people have not done a good enough job and the private expenditures are up in this kind of level for public expenditures. In fact, they are not. They have, ever since 1989, come down at a faster rate than the public expenditures come down and they are leading the way.

This is the point we need to keep in mind, then, Madam President, with respect to Medicare and the reforms that are necessary. We cannot demagog this issue. We must stick with the facts. Our goal is to make the system that takes care of our elderly as stable, as secure, and as certain for the future as the system that takes care of the rest of the population.

If we can do it as responsible public servants at the same rate of increase

that exists in the rest of the population, we can solve all of our budgetary problems and the disastrous circumstance indicated in this table will go away.

Madam President, I have nothing but respect for our distinguished minority leader. I consider him a friend and one of the more reasonable and certainly most thoughtful Members of this body. I feel that the information that he shared with the Senate last night is inaccurate, and it becomes Members in this debate to make sure that the record is set straight as quickly as possible, because the stakes in this debate are so high.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT NO. 1.

CBO estimates for total medical and health care spending in the public and private sector from 1985 until 1994. The figures include spending for administrative costs, construction, and research and development as well as personal health care costs associated with doctors and hospitals. The figures shown represent a percentage increase over the previous year's spending level.

MEDICAL EXPENDITURES

Year	Public (percent)	Private (percent)
1985	8.8	10.3
1986	8.9	6.1
1987	8.9	8.5
1988	9.0	12.6
1989	11.9	10.3
1990	13.2	10.6
1991	12.6	5.6
1992	10.8	6.9
1993	8.5	7.2
1994	7.8	5.3

Source: CRS.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH and Mr. PRYOR, pertaining to the introduction of S. 758 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition at this time. Therefore, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING A PRIVATE VISIT BY PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI, OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN, TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 53, expressing the sense of Congress regarding a private visit by the President of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am sorry I have to do this, but in behalf of another Senator who could not be here at this time, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

THE SENATE CHAMBER DESKS—A BRIEF HISTORY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, recently I announced that I was not going to be seeking another term in the Senate. It has been a wonderful opportunity these last 16½ years to serve in this great body, to be serving with all of my great colleagues and friends from all the 50 States, and all the wonderful staff people that make this place run. I just want to thank all of them so much for their many kindnesses shown to me.

Mr. President, I was cleaning out my desk a while ago and just looking through something I have had in my desk for some time that was prepared by some of the individuals, I think, in the Historian's office. That is not the proper name for those who prepared this. But I thought while there were interested parties involved, I might read a few pages of some of the history of the desks in this Chamber. This is a brief history.

When British troops burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 during the War of 1812, they severely damaged the Senate Chamber and destroyed the original furnishings. The rebuilt Chamber was completed in 1819 and the Senate ordered 48 new desks at a cost of \$34 each from Thomas Constantine. A New York cabinetmaker, he also constructed desks for the House of Representatives. Many of these early desks remain in use in the Senate Chamber today. As new states have entered the Union over the years, additional desks of identical design have been built and placed in use.

Throughout most of the 19th century a senator's only office was his desk on the Senate floor.

We did not have, I might say, the Senate office buildings. This was our office, the desk that was on the Senate floor.

but gradually separate rooms were assigned. The earliest offices were Committee rooms occupied by their chairmen; additional space later became available under the Olmsted Terraces on the West Front of the Capitol. Finally, with the completion of the first Senate office building [the Russell Building] in 1909, all senators were able to occupy suitable offices on Capitol Hill.

Over the years, modifications have been made to the Chamber desks to provide more room for books and papers. Beginning in the

1830s, three- to four-inch high mahogany writing boxes were added to each desk. The writing boxes were not installed all at one time, but periodically over the next 40 years, usually at the request of a desk's occupant. Senate vouchers record payments to carpenter R. B. Griffin for altering nine mahogany desks in 1860, shortly after the Senate moved to its present Chamber.

Not every senator preferred the modification, but today only one desk—"the Webster"—lacks a writing box. Senator Daniel Webster reputedly refused to have his desk added to on the grounds that if his predecessor had managed without the extra space, so could he. No succeeding occupant of Webster's desk has seen fit to abandon that opinion. In order to bring the height of the Webster desk into visual line with others in the Chamber, a raised base has been added. Although he was born in New Hampshire, Webster represented Massachusetts in the Senate, and the desk has continued to be associated with Webster's birth state. New Hampshire Senators Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton, for example, occupied the desk for long periods. In 1974, just before Cotton retired from the Senate, he secured the adoption of Senate Resolution 467 (93rd Cong., 2nd sess.), specifying that the Webster desk would henceforth always be assigned to the senior senator from New Hampshire.

Other early Senate desks bear design characteristics that allow their differentiation. The oldest desks incorporate wooden inlays of circular and rectangular banding at the sides, crotch veneer mahogany across the fronts, and narrow reeding on the feet. These features were incorporated in desks newly-made throughout the third quarter of the last century and may today be found in more than seventy of the present number.

The difference in shape and dimension among the desks is due to the original semi-circular arrangement in the Old Senate Chamber.

Not this Senate Chamber, but the Old Senate Chamber.

A desk's shape conformed to its position in the room: if on the aisle it was narrow and angled, if near the center it tended to be wider and more square. If the oldest desks could be rearranged to the original configuration, it is believed they would form a perfect semicircle.

During the mid-19th century, mahogany shelves were added near the bases of the desks. At the turn of the 20th century, the feet were enclosed with a metal grille and connected to a plenum chamber below the floor which provided ventilation.

That, Mr. President, was the air-conditioning system. We have a much better air-conditioning system now than they had then.

Inkwells and sanders atop the desks have also undergone change. Original inkwells were composed of clear cut glass, covered with square, flat tops that moved horizontally. In 1933, the remaining original inkwells were replaced by containers having hinged covers, because the earlier design was no longer manufactured.

Over the years the desks have been periodically rearranged, as new states sent senators and as party representation increased and diminished. When additional desks were required, these were generally made by private cabinetmakers, although the four newest desks—those constructed for Alaska (1959) and Hawaii (1960)—were built in the Senate's own cabinet shop.

Seven distinct numbering systems have been employed over the years to track the expanding group of desks and their locations. These numbers—both Roman and Arabic—

are still visible below and inside the desks in various places. The current system, instituted in 1957, consists of Roman numerals burned into the right-hand corner of the principal crosspiece beneath the desks. The desks are not arranged on the Senate floor in numerical order. The easiest method of tracing the heritage of each desk is to read the names carved inside desk drawers.

Now, in earlier years, the Members of the Senate carved their names in the desk drawers. I hate to say that in modern times I have looked in my desk drawer and some of the occupants of this desk even wrote their name, it appears, with a ball point pen. That is not quite as classy as carving.

It appears that such inscriptions are a 20th-century tradition, for the earliest recorded names date back only to the first decade of this century. Possibly some 19th-century senators inscribed their names in the desks, but these names have been lost when drawers were refinished. Not all names in drawers were personally inscribed by the senators. Many reveal an identical hand, suggesting either that older drawer bottoms were replaced and the names recopied, or that staff members, rather than senators, took responsibility for chronicling certain holders. In recent decades, senators have adhered more closely to a tradition of personally inscribing desks.

One difficulty in verifying the desks' 19th-century assignees is the fact that for many years Senate doorkeepers closely guarded such privileged information. Isaac Bassett, Senate page and doorkeeper from 1831 through 1895, feared that souvenir hunters might damage the historic furniture if it was widely known which pieces were used by the famous Senators Clay, Calhoun, or Senator Webster. Bassett the page and the doorkeeper had reasonable cause for alarm. In April 1861, when the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment was bivouacked temporarily in the Senate Chamber, literally living in the Senate Chamber, Bassett entered the room just in time to hear the sound of splitting wood on the Democratic side. Rushing to investigate, he found a Union soldier bayonetting the desk recently vacated by Jefferson Davis, then president of the Confederacy. "Stop! Stop! What are you doing?" Bassett shouted. "That is not Jeff Davis' desk—it belongs to the government of the United States. You were sent here to protect government property, not to destroy it." Today, a small block of wood inlay on the left side of the desk marks the spot where the bayonet once struck the desk of Jefferson Davis.

Traditions associated with Senate desks continue to evolve. A recent example is the so-called "Candy Desk". Each member of the Senate knows which desk is the candy desk. Senator George Murphy (R-CA) originated the practice of keeping a supply of candy in his desk for the enjoyment of fellow senators. This desk was subsequently passed on to other members for use, but the tradition of keeping candy in the desk that occupies that particular place in the back row of the Chamber continues today.

The custom of dividing the arrangement of Senate desks by party is almost as old as the parties themselves. Democrats traditionally sit on the presiding officer's right; Republicans on his left. But the division has not always been definitive as it is today.

In the Old Senate Chamber, an equal number of desks was placed on each side of the aisle, without regard to party size. When one party elected more than half the senators, some majority party members had to find space on the minority side. When the Senate moved to the modern Chamber in 1859, the

practice of dividing the desks equally continued for several years. But during the Civil War many Southern Democrats withdrew from the Senate and Republicans took their places on the Democratic side, even though empty desks were available on "their own" side.

The new Chamber was large enough to permit a somewhat flexible seating arrangement and in 1877 the practice began of moving desks back and forth across the center aisle to permit all majority members to sit together on the appropriate side of the aisle. From time to time since then, one party has elected such an overwhelming majority that it has become necessary to again have majority members sit on the minority side. For instance, during the 60th Congress (1907-1909) ten Republicans sat on the Democratic side, while during the 75th Congress (1937-1939) thirteen Democrats sat on the Republican side. Such seating became known as the "Cherokee Strip," meaning that the overflow of majority party senators were "off their reservation" [the Cherokee Strip in Oklahoma was land belonging neither to the Indian Territory nor to the United States]. By then it had become the practice for senior senators to take front row, center aisle seats; junior majority party members who filled the "Cherokee Strip" were assigned either rear row or end seats on the minority side of the chamber.

Senators independent of either party have traditionally chosen on which side of the aisle they preferred to sit. Once, during the 1950s, when Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon had left the Republican party but not yet joined the Democrats, he placed his chair temporarily in the middle of the center aisle in order to demonstrate his independence.

The seating of the majority and minority leaders at the front row desks on either side of the center aisle is a relatively recent Senate tradition, dating back only to 1927 for the Democrats and 1937 for the Republicans. In the 19th century, party leadership was not yet institutionalized. Certain senators were recognized as leaders for reasons of personal popularity and political skill, not elected to an official post by their parties. For example, Henry Clay always occupied a rear seat near the Chamber entrance. From that position he was able to signal party members as they came in before a vote, while vigorously denying the role of party floor leader.

Not until the 1890s did party caucus chairmen emerge as floor leaders and for the most part such leaders retain regular seats. Front row desks went to senior senators in the party. For many years, the front seat on the Republican side was held by Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., an insurgent who was frequently at odds with his party's majority. Two earlier Democratic leaders, John T. Morgan, in 1902, and Oscar W. Underwood, in 1921, took front row desks, each retaining that position after his service as leader had ended. Not until Underwood left the Senate did Democratic minority leader Joseph Robinson move to the front row desk, which he continued to hold as majority leader. Following Robinson's death, the desk went to his successor majority leader, Alben Barkley. The desk has been used by Democratic leaders ever since. On the Republican side, the front row desk was held by senior senators until 1937, when minority leader Charles McNary moved there, setting a precedent that continues today.

Mr. President, the actual office that prepared this report, and it was done in February 1995, was the Office of Senate Curator. I want to thank the Senate Curator for preparing this report.

Also, in the back of this report, it gives a history of desk No. 39. This is

desk No. 39, Mr. President, and it lists all of the Senators who have occupied this particular desk.

I just want to name a few of these. Some of these names may stand out. John Bankhead from Alabama occupied this particular desk. John Bankhead lived over on 19th Street, right off of Dupont Circle. John Bankhead was the father of Tallulah Bankhead. Tallulah Bankhead was one of the grand actresses during that period of time, and they lived on 19th Street, where I used to live.

Now, also, Patrick McCarran of Nevada occupied this particular desk, No. 39. He was the author, I assume, of the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which many people will recognize.

Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, occupied desk No. 39. Theodore Francis Green may have been—I do not know, that record may have been broken—but at one time he was the oldest Member to ever serve in the Senate. That may have been surpassed. I need to check and correct it. But he was the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee immediately preceding the chairmanship of Senator J. William Fulbright of the State of Arkansas.

Another very illustrious individual who has occupied desk 39 is Estes Kefauver, from Tennessee, known for his coonskin cap and all his grand campaigning as he ran for President and as he ran for Vice President. He really was a major force in the 1950's in the Democratic Party and in American politics.

Another great Senator who has occupied desk No. 39 is Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson, of course from Washington State, who passed away just a few years ago. He truly was one of the giants of the Senate. He occupied desk 39.

Frank J. Lausche, from the State of Ohio, occupied this desk, desk No. 39. For some of you who may not know, Frank J. Lausche, to the best of my recollection, served more terms as Governor than any other Governor elected in the history of America. I think he was Governor of his State for—it seems like well over a decade and perhaps even close to 2 decades, in the State of Ohio.

Mr. President, some of this may not seem too important to a lot of people, but there may be some students around who someday would want to know more about the Senate Chamber and about the desks in the Chamber.

As Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator COATS and myself take our constituents through the Capitol and sometimes sit with them in the galleries, sometimes people ask us about the aisle, where do the Republicans sit and where do the Democrats sit? And so we thought it might be a good time to put a little statement in the RECORD giving a little, brief history about this Chamber and some of the desks that make up this wonderful U.S. Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE INSOLVENCY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber an hour ago when the distinguished Senator from Utah, my colleague, Senator BENNETT, commented on remarks that I made earlier this morning. He is a person for whom I have immense respect and who I believe is a great student of many of the issues we address on the floor. But he and I have a very fundamental difference of opinion with regard to Medicare, and I wish to respond briefly to comments that he made today on that issue. I invite his reaction if he is within the sound of my voice.

He said in his remarks the Medicare trustees' report predicting insolvency only became available in April 1995; that it was not available 2 years ago when the President's deficit reduction package was debated.

The fact is that the Medicare trustees' report is available every year for all Members of Congress to see, and every year the report has been predicting insolvency of the Medicare trust fund, sometime between 1999 and the year 2003. So there should be no surprise with regard to the predictions of this year's trustees' report. I think the question is, how we will generate Medicare savings over the course of the next year, and how will we use those savings.

There are some who have advocated providing a significant tax cut for the wealthy. I think it is fair to say that when you cut Medicare to the extent that some have proposed it be cut, and then you propose a similar decrease in taxes for the very wealthiest among us, one would have to conclude that the cuts in Medicare will be used to pay for the tax cut for the wealthy. That was the main point I was making.

Regardless of whether people are willing to make that association, as valid as I believe it is, I think it is very clear everyone recognizes that, indeed, the Medicare trust fund is in serious trouble. In fact, the President's 1993 deficit reduction package addressed this issue through proposals designed to delay insolvency for several more years. Before the President's deficit reduction package was enacted, the trustees' report indicated the trust fund would be insolvent by 1999. As a result of the enactment of the 1993 reconciliation package, which all Democrats supported and every Republican opposed, we have been able to extend the viability of the trust fund for 3 more years, from the year 1999 to the year 2002. So we have made progress.

What many of us are saying now is, if we are going to continue to make progress, then clearly we have to go beyond what the reconciliation package did with respect to strengthening Medicare.

What we said last year is that we have to pass meaningful health care reform if we are to reduce further the rate of Medicare growth, without hurting beneficiaries and shifting costs onto families and businesses.

That is what we attempted to do last year. The Senator from Utah indicated that the President last year argued we needed \$118 billion in additional Medicare cuts. Well, the President proposed these reductions in the rate of growth of Medicare in the context of a health reform proposal that assured costs would not be shifted onto the private sector. Clearly we get cost shifting to the private sector when we cut Medicare without addressing private sector health care cost problems. That is why so many of us argued for so long—and, unfortunately, with so little success—last year that if we are ever going to solve Medicare's problems, we have to address our entire health care system's problems. Unfortunately, Republicans opposed that effort last year.

So, Mr. President, my point in addressing this issue is to clarify again what I believe to be the real issue. The real issue is that we have to make meaningful reforms to Medicare without adversely affecting the beneficiaries and without passing whatever savings we generate on to the wealthiest among us in the form of another tax cut. Real reform is not cutting benefits to the elderly or simply shifting more costs onto them. Real reform must ensure more efficient functioning and administration of the program.

The last issue that I wish to raise with regard to Medicare has to do with the chart the distinguished Senator from Utah used. My chart is not nearly as fancy because we didn't have time to make such an elegant chart, but I think it illustrates my point.

The Senator from Utah indicated that Medicare costs were going up faster than costs in the private sector.

Well, this is only true if you look at overall costs. But if you look at a more meaningful statistic, per capita health care costs, as this chart indicates—on a per enrollee basis, from 1976 to 1984, Medicare costs rose only slightly faster than private sector costs, 14.2 percent, versus 14 percent for the private sector.

But look what has happened from the years 1984 to 1993. In that timeframe, 1984 to 1993, about 10 years, the actual increase in private sector per enrollee costs was 9.8 percent. The increase in Medicare per enrollee costs was 7.7 percent.

These are numbers given to us from HCFA, and I think they make the point I was trying to make again this morning. On a per enrollee basis, there is no